

Appl. No. 09/176,639

Amdt. Dated March 14, 2006

Reply to Office action of December 14, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 24 and 52 - 96 are currently pending in the application. Applicants have canceled claims 1 -23, and 25- 51, and added new claims 64 - 96. Applicants request reconsideration of the application in light of the following remarks.

In the office action, claim 63 was allowed. Claim 24 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner stated claim that claim 24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim any intervening claims. Accordingly, applicants have amended claim 24 to include the limitations of independent claim 16, and thus submit that amended independent claim 24 is now allowable.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 16, 21-23, 25, 27-36, 37-40, 42-50, 52-59 and 60-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grabner et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,731,694), in view of Miller et al (U.S. Patent No 5,374,787), in light of Greanias et al (U.S. Patent No.5,386,219). Applicants respectfully disagree, and submit that applicants' claims are patentably distinct over the combination of cited references. Furthermore, applicants have cancelled some claims, and added new claims that further distinguish over the cited references. In general, the claimed invention facilitates an improved touch pad system by providing a conductive touch layer that creates a relatively larger image of the conductive object. The larger image increases the capacitance that can be detected, and thus facilitates improved detection by the sensor layer and thus improves position determination. See applicants' specification at page 8, lines 25 to page 9, line 17.

With regard to Grabner, the Examiner stated that Grabner disclosed a touch pad system comprising a sensor layer and an insulative layer (citing FIG. 1 items 7, 8 and 24, and column 3 lines 20-22, 31-61 and column 4, lines 26-30.) The Examiner noted that in one special embodiment of the touch pad the insulative layer 24 also comprises a metallized layer as a conductor on an upper flat surface. The Examiner alleged that it would have been obvious to make the sensor layer on the bottom, the insulative layer on top of the sensor layer, and the

Appl. No. 09/176,639

Amdt. Dated March 14, 2006

Reply to Office action of December 14, 2005

conductive layer on top of the insulative layer, stating that this order could be advantageous as to have better touch detection. The Examiner then admitted that Grabner does not disclose the touch layer having a conductivity selected to create an electrical image of a conductive object that is larger than an area of contact of said conductive object contacting said touch layer.

In response, applicants note that touch pad disclosed in Grabner is best described a resistive-based touch pad where a change in resistance is used to determine object location. Specifically, a pressure-dependent resistance is coupled to fixed capacity and used as the measuring variable. See the abstract of Grabner. See also column 4, lines 37-63 and FIG. 2 that illustrate an equivalent circuit diagram for the Grabner touch pad and describe it as being based upon a change in resistance due to pressure on the touch pad. Nowhere is Grabner described as forming a capacitor and sensing "the capacitance to determine a position of the conductive object" as recited in independent claim 52.

Furthermore, applicants note that the covering 24 of Grabner is described as metallized on its upper flat side and electrically grounded, with the metallization effective as a shield. See column 4, lines 26-29. Applicants submit that such a presumably high-conductivity, grounded layer would hinder any sort of effective capacitive detection of an image of a conductive object. Thus, Grabner does not teach capacitive detection, nor could the metallized layer 24 be used to generate an image that is capacitively detected.

With regard to Miller, the Examiner stated that Miller discloses a touch layer having a conductivity selected to create an image of a conductive object that is larger than an area of contact with said conductive object, citing column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 25 of Miller. Applicants respectfully disagree, and submit that the Examiner has mischaracterized the Miller reference. Instead, Miller specifically teaches an **insulative** touch layer. See column 8, lines 58-60 and FIG. 1D, where Miller teaches "An **insulating layer 24** is disposed over the sense pads 22 on the top surface 16 to **insulate** a human finger or other object therefrom" (emphasis added). Note that FIG. 1D clearly shows the insulating layer 24 on top the device. Thus, insulating layer 24 would clearly comprise the touch layer of the device. Any conductive elements described by Miller are in the underlying sensor layers, and would not be touched and

Appl. No. 09/176,639

Amdt. Dated March 14, 2006

Reply to Office action of December 14, 2005

thus not be part of any "touch layer". Thus, Miller clearly teaches an **insulative touch layer**. Miller likewise fails to teach a touch layer having any specified conductivity.

With regard to the Greanias, the Examiner stated that Greanias teaches a sensor layer that capacitively detects an image of a conductive object when a user places a conductive object proximate said touch layer, citing column 7 lines 14-23 and column 8, lines 19-50 of Greanias. Applicants agree that the Greanias reference does describe a touch pad that uses capacitance to detect the presence of a stylus or finger. However, Greanias, like Miller, also teaches an insulative touch layer.

For example, FIG. 1 and column 5, lines 43-63 of Greanias illustrate and describe a touch pad system. The overlay 16 of the Greanias touch pad is described as a laminate structure including several plastic substrate layers laminated together. Inside the overlay are conductors 16A disposed in the vertical direction and 16B disposed in the horizontal directions. The layers that make up the touch pad are illustrated in more detail in FIGS. 5, 6 7 and 8 Greanias. In all cases, the top cover or "touch layer" is either described as an insulator or its conductivity is not specified. For example, with regard to FIG. 5, the protective top cover 98 is described as being similar in composition to lower and upper substrates 90 and 94, and these substrates are described as being sheets of transparent, **insulating material**. See Greanias at column 17, lines 27-47. With regard to FIG. 6, the conductivity of the top layer 98 is not specified. However, given that the same reference numeral 98 is used it should again be interpreted to be an insulative layer. With regard to FIGS. 7 and 8, the top layer is an upper substrate 94, again using the same reference numeral that is described as a transparent insulating material with reference to FIG. 6. Finally, each of the independent claims 1, 10, 15, and 28 in Grabner recite a top cover "of a flexible, transparent, **insulating material**".

Thus, the Greanias reference does not teach the use of any top layer that has a "conductivity selected to create an image of a conductive object" as recited in applicants amended independent claim 52, and similarly recited in the other independent claims.

As stated above, the Examiner based the rejection on a combination of Greanias, Grabner and Miller. Specifically, the Examiner stated that "It would have been obvious to one

Appl. No. 09/176,639

Amdt. Dated March 14, 2006

Reply to Office action of December 14, 2005

of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate wherein the sensor layer capacitively detects the image of said conductive object when a user places a conductive object proximate said touch layer as shown by Greanias into that of Grabner et al. The feature of capacitive detection is advantageously disclosed by Greanias in column 3, lines 25-37, as it improves the accuracy of determining the position of the touch". Thus, the Examiner appears to allege the "metallized layer" of Grabner can be combined with the capacitive position determination of Greanias and Miller to provide the claimed invention.

Applicants disagree, and respectfully submit that the amended claims are patentably distinct over this alleged combination of references for several reasons. First, applicants submit that the references do not suggest the combination, and in fact teach away from the combination. Second, applicants submit that based on the teachings of the references, the alleged combination would be unworkable. Third, even if such a combination was appropriate and workable, it would not meet all of the claimed limitations.

Specifically, the references clearly teach away from the combination in that both references that teach capacitive position determination clearly also teach an insulative touch layer. Specifically, Miller teaches "An insulating layer 24 is disposed over the sense pads 22 on the top surface 16 to insulate a human finger or other object therefrom" (emphasis added) See column 8, lines 58-60 and FIG. 1D. Likewise, Greanias teaches a insulative touch layer, and each of the independent claims 1, 10, 15, and 28 in Greanias recite a top cover "of a flexible, transparent, **insulating** material". Thus, both Greanias and Miller expressly teach away from using conductive touch layer. Finally, while Grabner teaches a "metallized layer", it clearly is a resistive-based touch pad where a change in resistance is used to determine object location. Applicants further note that the Examiners stated justifications for making the combination are mere statements of general advantage, and thus cannot overcome express teaching away of the references.

Furthermore, applicants submit the proposed combination is likely unworkable. Specifically, applicants submit that combining a grounded "metallized layer" of Grabner as a touch layer in a capacitive touch pad such as those disclosed in Greanias or Miller would result

Appl. No. 09/176,639

Amdt. Dated March 14, 2006

Reply to Office action of December 14, 2005

in an unworkable combination. As stated above, the covering 24 of Grabner is described as **metallized on its upper flat side and electrically grounded, with the metallization effective as a shield**. See column 4, lines 26-29. Applicants submit that such a presumably high-conductivity, grounded layer would shield any sort of effective capacitive detection of a position of an image of a conductive object. In fact, acting as a "shield" is that stated purpose of the grounded metallized layer. See Grabner at column 4, lines 26-29. Thus, the grounded metallized touch layer of Grabner could not be combined with the capacitive position determination of Greanias or Miller without unduly limiting the functionality of the capacitive position determination system.

Finally, even if there was a proper motivation to combine that was not expressly taught away from by the references, and even if the proposed combination was workable, the combination of references still fails to render applicants' claims unpatentable because not all claimed limitations are found in the combination. Specifically, none of the references teach a conductive touch layer with "a conductivity configured to create an image of said conductive object that is larger than an area of contact of said conductive object" as recited in applicants' claim 52 and similarly recited in the other independent claims. As stated above, Miller teaches insulative touch layer. Likewise, Greanias teaches an insulative touch layer. Finally, Grabner teaches a metallized layer, but nowhere states that the conductivity of the metallized layer is selected to create a larger image for capacitive detection. That Grabner fails to teach such a conductivity is not surprising given that Grabner is a resistive-based touch pad and thus would not capacitively detect such an image at all. See above. Furthermore, applicants again note that such a presumably high-conductivity, grounded layer would shield any sort of effective capacitive detection of a position of an image of a conductive object, and that acting as a shield is the stated purpose of the metallized layer. Finally, applicants note that the Examiner admits that Grabner does not disclose a touch layer having a conductivity selected to create an image of a conductive object larger than an area of contact of said conductive object. See page 3, lines 1-3 of the office action.

In response to our arguments made in the Pre Appeal Brief of July 22, 2005, the Examiner states that "Miller teaches where the image corresponds to the outline of the finger"

Appl. No. 09/176,639

Amdt. Dated March 14, 2006

Reply to Office action of December 14, 2005

and that in the broadest interpretation, "creating an image larger than an area of contact" is shown by the outline of the finger, as the outline of the finger is an area larger than the finger. Applicants submit that this interpretation is based on an incorrect reading of the recited limitation. Specifically, in making this interpretation the Examiner is unacceptably parsing the limitation. The limitation is not one of an "image" alone, it is instead one of a "conductivity configured to create an image" (emphasis added, see claim 52). Thus, the limitation defines the **conductivity of the touch layer**, and thus cannot be met by the abstract idea that an outline of a finger may be larger than an area of contact. Furthermore, as stated repeatedly above, Miller specifically describes an insulative touch layer, and thus does not disclose a touch layer having a "conductivity configured to create an image of said conductive object that is larger than an area of contact of said conductive object to thereby increase the capacitance of the formed capacitor when contacting the conductive touch layer and facilitate sensing of the capacitance to determine a position of the conductive object" as recited in claim 52, and similarly recited in the other independent claims.

Thus, applicants submit that independent claims 24, 52, 63, 68 and 88 are patentably distinct over the cited references. Furthermore, as claims 53-62, 64-67, 69-87 and 89-96 depend from, and include all the limitations of their respective independent claims, they are also submitted to be patentably distinct over the cited references. Furthermore, the independent and dependent claims include various other limitations that are not found in the cited references.

In summary, and in view of the amendments herein, none of the references cited by the Examiner nor any other known prior art, either alone or in combination, disclose the unique combination of features disclosed in applicant's claims presently on file. For this reason, allowance of all of applicant's claims is respectfully solicited.

Mar. 14. 2006 9:42PM INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ PC
Appl. No. 09/176,639
Amdt. Dated March 14, 2006
Reply to Office action of December 14, 2005

No. 6989 P. 19

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 14 2006

CONCLUSION

The amendments herein added 4 total claims, resulting in fees due of \$200.00. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge this fee to Ingrassia Fisher & Lorenz deposit account no. 50-2091.

If any additional fees, including extension of time fees or additional claims fees, are due as a result of this response, please charge Ingrassia Fisher & Lorenz Deposit Account No. 50-2091. This authorization is intended to act as a constructive petition for an extension of time, should an extension of time be needed as a result of this response. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if this would in any way advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,
INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated March 14, 2006

Customer No. 29,906

By:



S. Jared Pitts
Reg. No. 38,579
(480) 385-5060